ERIC GIBSON
DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu

January 5, 2011

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form
(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. March, 2010)

1. Title; Project Number(s); Environmental Log Number:

   Star Ranch Specific Plan for a Residential and Commercial Development, 3810 05-002 (SP), 3800 05-008 (GPA), 3600 05-019(R), 3100 5459RPL1 (TM); 3910 05-20-003 (ER)

2. Lead agency name and address:
   County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
   5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,
   San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact: Dennis Campbell
   b. Phone number: (858) 505-6380
   c. E-mail: dennis.campbell@sdcounty.ca.gov

4. Project location:

   The proposed project is located at 31310 Highway 94 (near the intersection of Highway 94 and Buckman Springs Road) in the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan area of an unincorporated area of the County of San Diego; APNs 655-010-01, 02, 655-020-10, 655-030-10, 655-070-01, 655-080-01, 655-090-26, 655-100-11, and 655-030-22.

   Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1296, Grid J/5

5. Project Applicant name and address:

   Barry DeVorzon, 740 State Street, Suite 225
   Santa Barbara, CA 93101

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:	Mountain Empire Subregional Plan – Campo/ Lake Moreno Community Plan Area
Land Use Designation:	Rural Lands (RL-40), 1 unit per 40 gross acres Semi-Rural Residential (SR-1), 1 unit per 2, 4 or gross acres Village Residential (VR-2), 2 units per gross acre Rural Commercial (C-4), 2 units per gross acre, .35 or .60 FAR Public/Semi-Public Facilities (P/SP)
Density:	See above

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	
Minimum Lot Size:	
Special Area Regulation:	Special Study Area/Specific Plan

8. Description of project:

The project is a Specific Plan, General Plan Amendment, Rezone, and Vesting Tentative Map. Major Use Permits and a Vesting Site Plan are being requested for submittal. The project consists of 453 residential units and 9.9 acres of commercial space on an existing cattle ranch consisting of approximately 2,161 acre. The project site is located at 31310 Highway 94 in the Campo/Lake Morena Community Planning Group, within unincorporated San Diego County. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Rural Development Area (RDA) and Environmentally Constrained Area (ECA) and Land Use Designation (18) Multiple Rural Use (1 du/ 4, 8 or 20 acres). Zoning for the site is S92 (General Rural). The site contains an existing single family residence that would be retained. The project proposes changing the General Plan Designation to (21) Specific Planning Area and the Zoning the S88, Specific Plan Area.

Access would be provided by a total of four access points via private roads connecting to Highway 94 and Buckman Springs Road. Earthwork would consist approximately 1,000,000 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill material over a development footprint over approximately The total project footprint of developed area is approximately 350 acres.

The project proposes to be implemented in five phases, which will be further defined in the Specific Plan. The phasing is expected to occur as shown in the table below.

Phase	Components
1	71 Lots – 6,000 to 8,000 square feet 37 Lots – 9,000 to 10,000 square feet 37 Lots – 0.5 acre Waste Water Treatment Plant
2	92 Lots 9,000 to 10,000 square feet 8 Lots – 0.5 acre
3	60 Lots – 0.5 acre 12 Lots –2 to 4 acres Secondary offsite access road Water tank
4	48 Lots – 0.5 acre Secondary onsite/offsite access road Water Tank
5	40 Lots – 6,000 to 8,000 square feet 30 Lots – 9,000 to 10,000 square feet 18 Lots –2 to 4 acres 2 Commercial lots

There will be 9.9 acres of commercial located around the existing commercial area near Cameron Corners. There will also be several parks and open space area scattered throughout the development, totaling approximately 20 acres and a 2.2-acre wastewater treatment plant facility located southerly off Highway 94. The remaining acreage will be divided between areas retained to continue the active cattle ranching operations, and areas put into permanent biological open space to preserve sensitive environment resources, such as biological habitat and the floodway. The project also includes recreational trails and secondary offsite emergency access roads.

The project will receive water service from private wells located on the project site. Water service and emergency water storage will be designed to only accommodate the proposed project. No offsite water connections are required or proposed. Water service will be provided through one of the following entities:

1. Private ownership as an investor-owned utility,

2. Private ownership as a mutual water company, or

3. Annexation into an existing public agency.

The project will be served by on-site wastewater treatment facility constructed for the project. There are four potential options for sewer service for Star Ranch.

1. The latent powers of County Service Area (CSA) No. 112 could be activated to provide water and/or sewer service.

2. An independent special district could be formed (such as a public utility district or a new county water district).

3. A dependent special district could be formed (such as a county sanitation district).

4. Star Ranch could be annexed into the sphere and service area of the closest existing sewer service provider the San Diego County Sanitation District.

The following project design considerations would also be proposed to minimize environmental impacts: use of reclaimed water, use of low impact design (LID), and the clustering of residential and commercial sites away from areas containing floodplain, cultural resources, sensitive vegetation, and steep slopes.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

Uses surrounding the project site are characterized as residential, commercial, tribal lands, BLM lands, and ranchlands. The topography of the project site and adjacent land include pasture lands, valleys, floodplains, mountains, and developed areas. The site is located adjacent to the community of Cameron Corners and just north of Campo. Highway 94 runs through the eastern portion of the project site.

Many of the adjoining areas to the north, west and south are undeveloped. To the north of the site, off of Buckman Springs Road, are a few rural residential uses and the Campo Elementary School. Buckman Springs Road forms the northeasterly boundary of the project site and the areas to the northeast across Buckman Springs Road are comprised of vacant, rural residential and Kumeyaay Tribal Lands. At the intersection of State Route 94 and Buckman Springs Road is Cameron Corners, a community that contains general commercial and residential uses. Further to the east, to the north of State Route 94 are industrial uses and an auto storage use. On the south side of State Route 94 are more commercial uses, small-lot residential uses and the Campo Fire Station (CSA 112). Beyond these areas to the south and east of State Route 94 is pasture land followed by the Campo Creek floodplain. Bordering the Campo Creek floodplain are the tracks of the SD&A Railroad. To the southeast are various uses including: the 222-lot Campo Hills development; rural residential, civic uses such as a Fire Station and a Border Patrol facility. Adjoining the project site along the easterly portion of the south boundary are rural residential uses, Campo Creek, State Route 94 and civic and commercial uses.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Administrative Permit	County of San Diego
Final Map Modifications	County of San Diego
General Plan Amendment	County of San Diego
Habitat Loss Permit	County of San Diego
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Major Use Permits	County of San Diego
Rezone	County of San Diego
Road Opening	County of San Diego
Site Plan	County of San Diego
Specific Plan	County of San Diego
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Map Modification	County of San Diego
Remandment of Relinquished Access Rights	County of San Diego
Exploratory Borings, Direct-push Samplers and Cone Penotrometers Permits	County of San Diego
Groundwater Wells and Exploratory or Test Borings Permit	County of San Diego
Septic Tank Permit	County of San Diego
Underground Storage Tank Permit	County of San Diego
Water Well Permit	County of San Diego
Annexation to a City or Special District	Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
State Highway Encroachment Permit	CalTrans
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1603 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Section 7 - Consultation or Section 10a Permit – Incidental Take	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)
Air Quality Permit to Construct	Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
Air Quality Permit to Operate – Title V Permit	APCD
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB

General Industrial Storm water Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Sewer District Approval	Rincon-Del Campo Sewer District
Fire District Approval	CSA 112/DPLU/CALFIRE Fire Districts

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☒ Aesthetics	☒ Agriculture and Forest Resources	☒ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources	☒ Cultural Resources	☒ Geology & Soils
☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒ Hazards & Haz. Materials	☒ Hydrology & Water Quality
☒ Land Use & Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☒ Noise
☒ Population & Housing	☒ Public Services	☒ Recreation
☒ Transportation/Traffic	☒ Utilities & Service Systems	☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature — Date 12/29/11

Dennis Campbell — Printed Name

Land Use/Environmental Planner — Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes residential development, a commercial shopping area, and other associated uses. The project site is primarily grazing land surrounded by a scattered mixture of rural residential, small-lot residential, commercial uses and ranchlands. A detailed visual analysis must be included in the EIR to determine if the proposed development will have significant impacts to a scenic vista. The Pacific Crest Trail, which is considered a national scenic trail, crosses the western portion of the property. The proposed project has the potential to impact the scenic viewshed of hikers using the trail.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

The project site is located adjacent to State Highway 94 and Buckman Springs Road which are both County scenic highway corridors. The project would result in substantial landform modification and physical changes to the site that might be visible from these roadways. This potential direct and/or cumulative impact will be analyzed and discussed within the Aesthetics section of the EIR and within the Visual Impact Analysis report for this project.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as rural residential, ranchlands, country town, and rolling topography. The site also contains a portion of the Pacific Crest Trail (national scenic trail) which is used by hikers. The project has the potential to impact the existing rural community character of the area. A detailed visual analysis must be included in the EIR to determine if the proposed development will have significant impacts to visual character.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed commercial, residential and recreational areas may have potentially significant impacts from lighting if the development is not adequately implemented and regulated. Conformance to the Light Pollution Code is required and any proposed lighting will be reviewed to ensure that new sources of lighting would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. A photometric study would be required in order to assess potential impacts from light or glare.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is in an area that has a varied mixture of agricultural uses. The site itself has been used for grazing and for growing crops. Much of the site is underlain by Prime Farmland Soils and Statewide Significant Soils as defined by the NRCS and FMMP. Due to the potential loss of agricultural resources on the project site, an Agricultural Impact Analysis will be prepared and discussed within the context of the EIR.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The existing zoning for the site is S92 (General Rural Use Regulations). The S92 zone is applied to areas that are suitable for animal grazing. Parcels to the west are in Agricultural Preserves and are zoned A72 (General Agricultural). The proposed project would include a request to change the zoning to S88 (Specific Planning Area Use Regulations). The proposed specific plan will retain an existing agricultural use (horse and cattle grazing), however, a portion of the project area would be changed to a residential and commercial use which has many characteristics that are similar to urban development. An Agricultural Impact Analysis will be prepared and discussed within the context of the EIR in order to evaluate the conversion of agricultural resources to residential and commercial uses and any associated impacts upon surrounding parcels.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site including offsite improvements do not contain forest lands or timberland. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the project is consistent with existing zoning and a rezone of the property is not proposed. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland production zones.

d) Result in the loss of forest land , conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of offsite forest resources.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The introduction of urban type uses could result in additional similar development in the surrounding rural area. An agricultural analysis would be required in order to evaluate the conversion of agricultural lands to residential and commercial uses. The project must evaluate the potential impact that could occur to surrounding agricultural properties and operations as a result of the land uses proposed on the project site. An Agricultural Impact Analysis will be prepared and discussed within the context of the EIR to consider land use compatibility of the proposed uses with the viability of ongoing agricultural uses on-site and in the surrounding area.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project has the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of an air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, primarily related to traffic, construction activities related to the proposed 418 residential units and 125,000 square feet of commercial uses, proposed waste water treatment plant (and storage of related chemicals), proposed water plant (and storage of related chemicals), equestrian center, vehicles, construction activities and grading operations (approximately 1 million cubic yards of soil movement). Therefore, because the proposed project may conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP, an Air Quality Analysis of project-generated emissions would be prepared and discussed in the EIR. Likewise, the analysis shall address the project's contribution to a cumulative air quality impact.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

The project has the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of an air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, primarily related to traffic, construction activities and grading operations. Therefore, the project is required to discuss the project's potential impacts to air quality in the context of the Draft EIR and in an air quality analysis.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O_3). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

The project has the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of an air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, primarily related to traffic, construction activities and grading operations. Therefore, the project is required to discuss the project's potential impacts to cumulative air quality in the context of the Draft EIR and in an air quality analysis.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. Campo Elementary School is located to the north of the proposed project and a library is on-site. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly. Residential uses are located to the north, east, and south of the project site. The project has the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of an air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, primarily related to traffic, construction activities and grading operations. Therefore, the Draft EIR and air quality analysis shall include a discussion of the project's potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project would include a waste water treatment plant, water facility, and equestrian facility. The requested air quality analysis shall address odors and any impact upon existing/proposed on-site uses and existing surrounding uses. Therefore, the air quality analysis and Draft EIR shall evaluate the potential for the Proposed Project to produce objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site consists of grazing lands, northern mixed chaparral, granitic northern mixed chaparral, open coast live oak woodland, southern riparian scrub, and flat topped buckwheat. Pursuant to the CEQA and the Resource Protection Ordinance (in addition to state and federal laws), impacts to listed, or otherwise rare species must be minimized and often avoided entirely.

Therefore, based on the fact that the site has the potential to support several endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats the project may have a potentially significant impact on biological resources. As such any potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats must be addressed in the context of the Biological Resources Report and the EIR.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The site supports a number of wetland habitats and wetland buffers within the project site. These wetlands and wetland buffers may be significantly impacted by the proposed project and as proposed the project may not conform to the wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance. Therefore, impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers and conformance with the Resource Protection Ordinance must be demonstrated and discussed in the context of a Biological Resources Report and the EIR.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The site contains a number of drainages and wetland habitats, which if impacted may result in significant alterations to known watersheds or wetlands that may be considered California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and would potentially require a Section 1603 "Streambed Alteration Agreement" and/or 404 Permit. Therefore, all significant drainages and wetlands must be defined and impacts identified in a Biological Resources Report and in the EIR.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Potential wildlife corridors areas exist throughout the project site. Wildlife corridors potentially exist along natural drainages through various sensitive habitat types on-site, including: Diegan coastal sage scrub; riparian areas and wetlands. The current project design may potentially impact these corridors and may create additional indirect impacts through increased noise and activity. Therefore, any potentially significant impacts to wildlife dispersal corridors must be discussed in the Biological Resources Report and the EIR.

e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat

conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project would be required to comply with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), and Habitat Loss Permit (HLP). Potential conformance issues will be addressed in the Biological Resources Report and incorporated into the EIR.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed Star Ranch project encompasses approximately 2,160 acres of land in the Campo/Lake Morena Community Plan area of the County of San Diego. The ranch is rich in prehistoric and historic resources, being the oldest, continuously operating ranch in the County as well as a known Native American Kumeyaay settlement area dating back at least 1000 years. The presence of Campo Creek and other water sources, plentiful food resources and large relatively flat valleys indicate a very high potential for extensive historic and prehistoric cultural resources. Therefore, an evaluation of historical resources within the area of potential effect will be conducted with the findings presented in a cultural resources report and in the Draft EIR.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed Star Ranch project encompasses approximately 2,160 acres of land in the Campo/Lake Morena Community Plan area of the County of San Diego. The ranch is rich in prehistoric and historic resources, being the oldest, continuously operating ranch in the County as well as a known Native American Kumeyaay settlement area dating back at least 1000 years. The presence of Campo Creek and other water sources, plentiful food resources and large relatively flat valleys indicate a very high potential for extensive prehistoric cultural resources. There is no evidence that the project area has ever been surveyed for cultural resources. Therefore, a cultural resources report will be prepared to document cultural resources on the site and to assess their significance. A discussion of the findings and recommendations will be included in the Draft EIR.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County. The project proposes to grade approximately 273.85 acres; therefore, there is potential that excavations could impact significant unique geologic features. Accordingly, documentation of the site's potential to support significant geologic features will be assessed and discussed in the Draft EIR.

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project has low potential for containing paleontological resources and will excavate the substratum and/or bedrock below the soil horizons.

A monitoring program implemented by the excavation/grading contractor will be required. Equipment operators and others involved in the excavation should watch for fossils during the normal course of their duties. In accordance with the Grading Ordinance, if a fossil or fossil assemblage of greater than twelve inches in any dimension is encountered during excavation, all excavation operations in the area

where the fossil or fossil assemblage was found shall be suspended immediately, the County's Permit Compliance Coordinator shall be notified, and a Qualified Paleontologist shall be retained by the applicant to inspect the find to determine if it is significant. A Qualified Paleontologist is a person who has, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Land Use Director:

- A Ph.D. or M.S. or equivalent in paleontology or closely related field (e.g., sedimentary or stratigraphic geology, evolutionary biology, etc.);
- Demonstrated knowledge of southern California paleontology and geology; and
- Documented experience in professional paleontological procedures and techniques.

If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that the fossil or fossil assemblage is significant; a mitigation program involving salvage, cleaning, and curation of the fossil(s) and documentation shall be implemented. If no fossils or fossil assemblages of greater than 12 inches in any dimension are encountered during excavation, a "No Fossils Found" letter will be submitted to the County Department of Planning and Land Use identifying who conducted the monitoring and that no fossils were found. If one or more fossils or fossil assemblages are found, the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a report documenting the mitigation program, including field and laboratory methodology, location and the geologic and stratigraphic setting, list(s) of collected fossils and their paleontological significance, descriptions of any analyses, conclusions, and references cited.

Therefore, with the implementation of the above project requirements during project grading operations, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant. Furthermore, the project will not result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources because other projects that require grading in sensitive paleontological resource areas will be required to have the appropriate level of paleontological monitoring and resource recovery. In addition, other projects that propose any amount of significant grading would be subject to the requirements for paleontological monitoring as required pursuant to the County's Grading Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant direct, indirect, or cumulatively significant loss of paleontological resources.

e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed Star Ranch project encompasses approximately 2,160 acres of land in the Campo/Lake Morena Community Plan area of the County of San Diego. The ranch is rich in prehistoric and historic resources, being one of the oldest operating ranches in the County. In addition, the project site was a

Native American Kumeyaay settlement area dating back at least 1000 years. The presence of Campo Creek and other water sources, plentiful food resources and large relatively flat valleys indicate a very high potential for extensive prehistoric cultural resources. Therefore, the potential for impacts to archaeological resources, including human remains, will be evaluated in the Cultural Resources Report and discussed in the context of the EIR.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. A Geotechnical Report would be required in order to determine whether or no the project on-site conditions have susceptibility to settlement and liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. A Geotechnical Report will be required in order to determine whether or no the project on-site conditions have susceptibility to settlement and liquefaction. Although the project site is not within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes a residential and commercial development that may result in unprotected erodible soils and may alter topography and drainage patterns. According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site

are identified as Chino find sandy loam, La Posta rocky loamy coarse sandy loam, Mottsville loamy coarse sandy loam, La Posta loamy coarse sandy loam, Tollhouse rock coarse sandy loam, Acid igneous rock land, and Calpine coarse sandy loam that have a soil erodibility rating of "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be prepared as part of the project to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit. The SWPPP will outline measures to control erosion. The measures would also be discussed in the context of the EIR to be prepared for the project.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Chino fine sandy loam which has a moderate shrink/swell classification. The remaining soil types (La Posta rocky loamy coarse sandy loam, Mottsville loamy coarse sandy loam, La Posta loamy coarse sandy loam, Tollhouse rock coarse sandy loam, Acid igneous rock land, and Calpine coarse sandy loam) have a low shrink/swell classification. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be prepared as part of the project to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit. The SWPPP will outline measures to control erosion. The measures would also be discussed in the context of the EIR.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are Chino find sandy loam, La Posta rocky loamy coarse sandy loam, Mottsville loamy coarse sandy loam, La Posta loamy coarse sandy loam, Tollhouse rock coarse

sandy loam, Acid igneous rock land, and Calpine coarse sandy loam. The project would be required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. In order to assess that these soils would not create substantial risks to life or property, a Geotechnical Report will be required. The measures will also be discussed in the context of the EIR.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to utilize a waste water treatment facility for most of the proposed residential and commercial uses. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems for disposal of human waste.

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons (HFCs), and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources. A regional GHG inventory prepared for the San Diego Region[1] identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for

[1] San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory: An Analysis of Regional Emissions and Strategies to Achieve AB 32 Targets. University of San Diego and the Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC), September 2008.

46% of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (25%) and third (9%) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions. According to the San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory (2008), the region must reduce its GHG emissions by 33 percent from "business-as-usual" emissions to achieve 1990 emissions levels by the year 2020. "Business-as-usual" refers to the 2020 emissions that would have occurred in the absence of the mandated reductions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. Development of regional targets is underway and SANDAG is in the process of preparing the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which will be a new element of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The strategy will identify how regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by the ARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

In addressing the potential for a project to generate GHG emissions that would have a potentially significant cumulative effect on the environment, a 900 metric ton threshold was selected to identify those projects that would be required to calculate emissions and implement mitigation measures to reduce a potentially significant impact. The 900 metric ton screening threshold is based on a threshold included in the CAPCOA white paper[2] that covers methods for addressing greenhouse gas emissions under CEQA. The CAPCOA white paper references the 900 metric ton guideline as a conservative threshold for requiring further analysis and mitigation. The 900 metric ton threshold was based on a review of data from four diverse cities (Los Angeles in southern California and Pleasanton, Dublin, and Livermore in northern California) to identify the threshold

[2] See CAPCOA White Paper : "CEQA &Climate Change: *Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act* " January 2008 (http://www.capcoa.org/rokdownloads/CEQA/CAPCOA%20White%20Paper.pdf).

that would capture at least 90% of the residential units or office space on the pending applications list. This threshold will require a substantial portion of future development to minimize GHG emissions to ensure implementation of AB 32 targets is not impeded. By ensuring that projects that generate more than 900 metric tons of GHG implement mitigation measures to reduce emissions, it is expected that a majority of future development will contribute to emission reduction goals that will assist the region in meeting its GHG reduction targets.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) states that an EIR shall analyze greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a proposed project when the incremental contribution of those emissions may be cumulatively considerable.

GHG emissions from the project will be generated from vehicle trips, water consumption, disturbance of soils, consumption of fossil fuels to run various equipment, and construction operations. The project will complete a GHG emissions analysis including an inventory of GHG emissions. This information will be presented in the technical report and EIR. Any potential impacts will be evaluated and mitigation measures identified as necessary.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

GHG emissions from the project will be generated from vehicle trips, water consumption, disturbance of soils, and consumption of fossil fuels to run various equipment, and construction operations. The project will complete a GHG emissions analysis including an inventory of GHG emissions to determine whether it would impede the implementation of AB 32 GHG reduction targets. This information will be presented in the technical report and EIR. Any potential impacts will be evaluated and mitigation measures identified as necessary.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes a waste water treatment plant and water treatment facility which would involve the routine use and storage of hazardous materials. A Risk Management Plan (RMP) would be required in order to assess the impacts of regulated substances such as chlorine gas and ammonia, which are used in these types of facilities. The RMP would also include a hazard assessment program, an accidental release prevention program, and an emergency response plan. The analysis would also be discussed in the context of the requested EIR.

b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing school. The proposed project includes a wastewater treatment facility and water treatment plant which would involve the storage and handling of hazardous substances. The proposed project would include a business, operation and/or facility that will handle regulated substances (i.e. waste water treatment plant, water treatment facility) subject to California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Requirements and is located within one-quarter mile of an existing school. A Risk Management Plan (RMP) would be required in order to assess the impacts of regulated substances such as chlorine gas and ammonia, which are used in these types of facilities. The RMP would include a hazard assessment program, an accidental release prevention program, and an emergency response plan. The analysis would also be discussed in the context of the requested EIR to be prepared for the project.

c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known

to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

☒	Potentially Significant Impact	☐	Less than Significant Impact
☐	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☐	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The majority of the Star Ranch project area overlaps with the western portion of the Camp Lockett Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS). Camp Lockett was established in 1941 on 702 leased acres. In 1942, the Army acquired approximately 7,000 additional acres for a training facility. The expansion included various types of target ranges for weapons including small arms, grenades, mortar rounds, and artillery. The Camp was used between 1941 and 1946 for training, patrolling the US-Mexico border, a military hospital, and a prisoner of war camp. A target pit, .30 and .50 caliber bullets and fragments from mortars or rockets have been found since the Department of Defense closed the site in 1946. Landowners have also reported the presence of munitions debris. Other suspected ordnance types including small arms ranging from .30 cal to .50 cal, 37mm projectiles, 75mm projectiles, mortars, rifle grenades, and hand grenades (smoke, irritant, tearing agent). Original target remnants are present onsite and there is a high potential for unexploded ordnance (UXO) on the ground surface or below the ground surface. UXO are military munitions that did not blow up when they were supposed to, and could blow up at any time. UXO could include live rounds, practice rounds with explosive spotting charges, and chemical propellants.

Currently, the Camp Lockett site is scored Risk Assessment Code (RAC) 2 overall, indicating high risk, based on a critical hazard severity and a probable hazard probability as identified in the Archives Search Report. For RAC 1-4, action is required to mitigate the hazard or protect personnel.

The western side of the Camp Lockett site, where the Star Ranch project is located, is not currently identified as a target range, due to the lack of historical evidence or munitions debris in that area. Therefore it is unlikely that UXO would be present in that area. However, the eastern edge of the project site is located within 1,000 feet of a mortar range where potentially lethal unexploded ordnance may be present. Munitions debris was observed somewhere in the mortar range area in 2001 but the area could not be accessed during the 2007 Site Investigation. The presence, density, and distribution of UXO will be more conclusively determined by the Army Corps of Engineers in their Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study (RI/FS) process, but at this time, the timing of the RI/FS is unknown.

Due to the possible presence of unexploded ordnance in the project area, the project will be conditioned for notification and training of all personnel entering the site during the site development process.

Hazardous Materials and Existing Contamination: There is a solid waste burnsite and transfer station located within 1,000 feet of the project site. Therefore, a Phase I ESA will be required to determine whether burn ash or other contamination may have entered the site.

Based on these observations, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) must be completed for the subject parcel. If the submitted Phase I ESA indicates that a potentially hazardous condition may exist onsite, further soil testing associated with a Limited Phase II ESA will be required to identify whether site conditions represent a human health or environmental hazard. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) will be required and discussed within the context of the EIR.

d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), within a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface, or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The Department of Planning and Land Use has completed review of the project design and has determined that the project may expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project is adjacent to and within wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. A Fire Protection Plan (FPP) shall therefore be prepared for the project. The Fire Protection Plan shall follow the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Wildland Fire and Fire Protection, available online at http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/docs/Fire-Guidelines.pdf, and the County's Report Format and Content Requirements for Wildland Fire and Fire Protection, available online at: http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/docs/Fire-Report-Format.pdf Fire management and defensible space would be further discussed within the requested Fire Protection Plan and EIR to be prepared for this project.

h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project does involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations, and a sewer package treatment plant facility. Therefore, the project may expose people to significant risk of injury involving vectors. A Vector Management Plan must be

developed and approved by the County Department of Environmental Health, Vector Surveillance Program, to ensure people will not be exposed to vectors. The Vector Management Plan will be developed for inclusion in the EIR and analyses

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes a residential and commercial development (including a waste water treatment facility and water treatment plant) which would require waste discharge permits (NPDES permits for discharges of storm water associated with construction activities, etc.). Permits regulating industrial stormwater runoff include NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities. One of the requirements through the Industrial Storm Water Permit, which is obtained from the State Water Resources Control Board, is the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The NPDES permit controls and allows for the discharge of stormwater associated with industrial activities and is needed for industrial businesses falling within certain categories or that conduct business under certain Standard Industrial Classification codes. Compliance with these regulations relating to waste discharge will be analyzed within the context of the EIR and supporting technical documents.

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project lies in the Canyon City (911.82) hydrologic subarea, within the Tijuana hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, portions of this watershed are impaired. The Tijuana River is impaired for eutrophication, coliform bacteria, organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen, pesticides, solids, synthetic organics, trace elements, and trash; Tijuana River Estuary is impaired for eutrophication, coliform bacteria, lead, nickel, pesticides, thallium, trash; and the Pacific Ocean at the Tijuana River mouth is impaired for coliform bacteria. Constituents of concern in the Tijuana River watershed include: Freshwater: coliform bacteria, nutrients, trace metals, pesticides, miscellaneous toxics, low dissolved oxygen, and trash; Groundwater: total dissolved solids, nitrates, petroleum, MTBE, and

solvents. A Stormwater Management Plan for Priority Projects is required to address the potential increase in pollutants and should include BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. The proposed project must demonstrate that Low Impact Development (L.I.D.) and Hydromodification criteria are satisfied. Therefore, the EIR and supporting technical documents would discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs that would be employed as required by the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO).

c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan. The project lies in the Canyon City (911.82) hydrologic subarea, within the Tijuana hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, portions of this watershed are impaired. The Tijuana River is impaired for eutrophication, coliform bacteria, organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen, pesticides, solids, synthetic organics, trace elements, and trash; Tijuana River Estuary is impaired for eutrophication, coliform bacteria, lead, nickel, pesticides, thallium, trash; and the Pacific Ocean at the Tijuana River mouth is impaired for coliform bacteria. Constituents of concern in the Tijuana River watershed include: Freshwater: coliform bacteria, nutrients, trace metals, pesticides, miscellaneous toxics, low dissolved oxygen, and trash; Groundwater: total dissolved solids, nitrates, petroleum, MTBE, and solvents. To ensure adequate maintenance of the recharge project, the County would require a Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (GMMP), which would specify ongoing groundwater monitoring and reporting requirements. Groundwater investigation work and the preparation of a GMMP would be conducted by a qualified hydrogeologist. This technical study would be discussed in the context of the EIR along with the SWPPP requirements to address any potential degradation of beneficial uses.

d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project would obtain its water supply from groundwater sources for domestic and commercial demands. Based on the potential impacts the project may have on groundwater resources, a groundwater investigation is required to evaluate the significance of potential impacts. The groundwater investigation report must be completed using the County's approved Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements which can be found on the World Wide Web at http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/docs/GRWTR-Guidelines.pdf (Guidelines) http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/docs/GRWTR-Report-Format.pdf (Report Formats). The project is also subject to the Groundwater Ordinance. The investigation must meet the requirements of the SAN DIEGO COUNTY GROUNDWATER ORDINANCE NO. 9826 (NEW SERIES). This document is available at http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu/docs/GROUNDWATER-ORD.pdf. The impacts to groundwater resources on and around the site would be analyzed and discussed within the Groundwater Investigation Report, the requested EIR and as part of the Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (GMMP).

e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: A Storm Water Management Plan is required and shall outline BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. The SWMP should specify L.I.D. compliant project design features and include Hydromodification calculations as required for projects greater than 50 acres. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project may result in significantly increased erosion or siltation on- and off-site and therefore, would be analyzed within the context of the EIR and a hydrology/drainage study.

f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation ☐ No Impact

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: A drainage study is required and shall outline adequate mitigation for any increase of surface runoff. Based upon information submitted by the applicant, the project may have peak flows that would increase by 280 cfs over existing conditions. Mitigation measures would need to be provided. A drainage study is required to address these issues. Potential effects would be analyzed within the context of the EIR and the preliminary hydrology study.

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project has the potential to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. The proposed project may result in the conversion of approximately 375 acres of previously pervious land to impervious surfaces. This amount of conversion to impervious surfaces without mitigation may affect downstream properties. A drainage study is required to demonstrate that runoff water would not exceed the capacity of planned storm water drainage systems. Therefore, the drainage study and EIR must analyze and address the project's affect on surface runoff in relation to existing and planned storm water drainage systems.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: streets, parking lots, construction activities, equestrian facilities, etc. A Stormwater Management Plan for Priority Projects is required to address site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable. The project will have several potential sources of polluted runoff primarily from, but not limited to, on-site equipment, maintenance, and trucking activities. Therefore, the EIR/SWMP must analyze and discuss appropriate site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs that will be employed. Also,

the EIR/SWMP would need to demonstrate how potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner that would not result in any substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains and drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site. Drainage swales (which are mapped on FEMA Map Numbers 06073C2300F and 06073C2275F), floodplain and floodway (which are mapped on County Floodplain Panel Numbers 162-1929 and 166-1929) were identified on the project site. The report should describe drainage structures and locate them on a project map. No development should be planned that would disrupt drainage or cause off-site flooding. The requested drainage study and EIR are required to address these issues.

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site contains drainage swales (mapped on FEMA Map Numbers 06073C2300F and 06073C2275F), which are identified as being 100-year flood hazard areas. The project also contains floodplain and floodway areas (mapped on County Floodplain Panel Numbers 162-1929 and 166-1929) which are also identified as being 100-year flood hazard areas. The project is proposing to place access roads for Units 1, 3, and 10 which may impede or redirect flood flows in these areas. The requested drainage study and EIR are required to address these issues.

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project lies within a special flood hazard areas identified on FEMA Map Numbers 06073C2300F and 06073C2275F, also on County Floodplain Panel Numbers 162-1929 and 166-1929. The project is located at an elevation that would prevent exposure of people or property to flooding. However, the project is proposing to place access roads for Units 1, 3, and 10 which may impede or redirect flood flows in these areas. Potential impacts due to flood hazards should be identified and discussed within the EIR.

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

Less Than Significant: The project site is located approximately 4 miles south of the Morena Reservoir; however, the elevation differential between the proposed development and the shoreline and intervening ranges would prevent inundation from a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

Potentially Significant Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. A Geotechnical Report and Hydrology Report have been requested in order to determine if the area shows evidence of either pre-existing or potential conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity or exposed soils. The analysis will be incorporated into the EIR

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to introduce either new infrastructure such as water supply systems and utilities to the area. The water supply system would be designed to serve only the proposed project. The proposed waste water treatment plant would be designed to utilize an existing treatment facility. The proposed project may disrupt or divide the established community for the following reasons: the proposed project is located along the western portion of the community of Campo and would not create a physical division.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 1.4 (Rural Development Area) and 1.6 (Environmentally Constrained Areas) and General Plan Land Use Designation 18 (Multiple Rural Use). The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 4, 8, or 20 (slope dependent) and not more than 0.25 dwelling units per acre. The current zone is S92 (General Rural), which requires a net minimum lot size of 4, 8 or 20 acres depending upon slope. The project is utilizing clustering and would be permitted if the Regional Land Use Category was changed from RDA to CT, and an ECA change to RDA.

The proposed project would need to demonstrate consistency with the policies of the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan, County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance and the County of San Diego General Plan. The analysis will be included in the EIR.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

☐ **Potentially Significant Impact**
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ **Less than Significant Impact**
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: A portion of the project site is shown to be be underlain with alluvial deposits based on the presence of Quaternary alluvium as shown in geologic resource mapping completed by the County of San Diego. Within the unincorporated area of the County, alluvial sand and gravel deposits are generally found in river and stream valleys, alluvial fans, and in intermountain alluvial valleys. There is potential for the site to contain mineral resource deposits onsite suitable for crushed rock based on the presence of rock formations on the property.

The land within the project site have not been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997); but the site is underlain with Quaternary alluvium, which is an important mineral and economic resource in San Diego County because it is a common element in many construction materials. There are no past or present mining operations on site. There are no known existing mining operations within 1,300 feet of the project site.

Based on review of the geologic mapping of the site, the Quaternary alluvium follows the floodplain that traverses the eastern portion of the site. The alluvial deposits that are of economic value for construction materials are found within this flood plain area where water flows along the lower elevations of the property. The proposed project would not be developing within the floodplain area. Additionally, the project design includes open space around most of the floodplain area to maintain existing agricultural uses (i.e., cattle ranching). The open space easements would include restrictions that would permit the continued grazing operation, but preclude development within the easement area. Of the 2,161 acres of project property, approximately 350 acres (16%) will be used for development. The remaining area, approximately 1,811 acres, will remain undeveloped and protected by easement. The areas of alluvial deposits would be within the open space area. The open space area, the western portion of the property in particular, also contains the areas with a substantial amount of rock outcroppings, located at the higher elevations.

The project site does not represent a large or substantial portion of the area designated as Quaternary alluvium. The mapped alluvial deposits are shown to be on the project site and adjacent to the site to the east in areas that are already partially developed. The Quaternary alluvium is isolated from nearest other deposits which are in the communities of Potrero and Pine Valley. Development of this property for residential

uses would not result in a substantial loss to an available mineral resource in the County of San Diego.

Therefore, the project would not result in the permanent conversion of these resources that would preclude all future extraction potential. With the incorporation of the project design which would avoid development in the floodplain, potential impacts to mineral resources are considered less than significant because the available alluvial deposits and crushed rock material would not be lost from all future use.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: A portion of the project site is shown to be underlain with alluvial deposits based on the presence of Quaternary alluvium as shown in geologic resource mapping completed by the County of San Diego. Within the unincorporated area of the County, alluvial sand and gravel deposits are generally found in river and stream valleys, alluvial fans, and in intermountain alluvial valleys. There is potential for the site to contain mineral resource deposits onsite suitable for crushed rock based on the presence of rock formations on the property.

The land with the project site has not been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997); and the project site is zoned Special Study Area, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with and Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). However, the site is underlain with Quaternary alluvium, which is an important mineral and economic resource in San Diego County because it is a common element in many construction materials.

There are no past or present mining operations on site. There are no known existing mining operations within 1,300 feet of the project site, and as such the project would not introduce an incompatible land use to an existing mining or mineral extraction operation. The proposed project would not hinder the operations of an existing offsite mining operation because residential land uses would result in increased noise, nuisance dust, and traffic.

XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is adjacent to Buckman Springs Road (Collector Road) and State Highway 94 (Major Road), and thus is impacted by noise from these roads/highways in the County Circulation Element. In addition, the proposed project area is in proximity to the railroad (SD & AE Railway). The project would include residential and commercial uses that would include the use of HVAC units, construction and grading activities, and other noise generating uses. Preliminary noise prediction estimates indicate that without site-specific noise mitigation measures, "noise sensitive" uses at the project site may be impacted by road noise levels that exceed the applicable sound limits of the Noise Element of the General Plan. Based on the above information, an Acoustical Analysis for this project is required. Potential effects would be analyzed and discussed in the project acoustical analysis and discussed within the EIRon the above information, an acoustical (noise) study for this project may be required.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is adjacent to Buckman Springs Road (Collector Road) and State Highway 94 (Major Road), and thus is impacted by noise from these roads/highways in the County Circulation Element. In addition, the proposed project area is in proximity to the railroad (SD & AE Railway). The project would include residential and commercial uses that would include the use of HVAC units, and other noise generating uses. Preliminary noise prediction estimates indicate that without site-specific noise mitigation measures, "noise sensitive" uses at the project site may be impacted by road noise levels that exceed the applicable sound limits of the Noise Element of the General Plan. Potential effects would be analyzed and discussed in the Acoustical Analysis and EIR.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is adjacent to Buckman Springs Road (Collector Road) and State Highway 94 (Major Road), and thus is impacted by noise from these roads/highways in the County Circulation Element. In addition, the proposed project area is in proximity to the railroad (SD & AE Railway). The project would include residential and commercial uses that would include the use of HVAC units, and other noise generating uses. Preliminary noise prediction estimates indicate that without site-specific noise mitigation measures, "noise sensitive" uses at the project site may be impacted by road noise levels that exceed the applicable sound limits of the Noise Element of the General Plan. Based on the above information, an acoustical (noise) study for this project is required. Potential effects would be analyzed and discussed in the project acoustical analysis and EIR.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is adjacent to Buckman Springs Road (Collector Road) and State Highway 94 (Major Road), and thus is impacted by noise from these roads/highways in the County Circulation Element. In addition, the proposed project area is in proximity to the railroad (San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railway). The project would include residential and commercial uses that would include the use of HVAC units, and other noise generating uses. Preliminary noise prediction estimates indicate that without site-specific noise mitigation measures, "noise sensitive" uses at the project site may be impacted by road noise levels that exceed the applicable sound limits of the Noise Element of the General Plan. Potential effects would be analyzed and discussed in the Acoustical Analysis and EIR.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project includes the following aspects which may be considered to be growth inducing: new infrastructure, public facilities, new commercial facilities, large scale residential development, a general plan amendment, and a zone reclassification. Growth induction can result in a wide variety of potential impacts, which must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has a single family residence, which is to remain. This residential development would not displace any amount of

existing housing. Potentially a total of 418 single-family dwellings and 125,000 square feet of commercial space will exist when the lots are developed.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has a single family residence, which is to remain. This residential development would not displace any amount of existing housing. Potentially a total of 418 single-family dwellings and 125,000 square feet of commercial space will exist when the lots are developed.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i. Fire protection?
ii. Police protection?
iii. Schools?
iv. Parks?
v. Other public facilities?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on the service availability forms previously received for the project, the proposed project may result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities in relation to schools, water, and sewer. The expansion and construction of which will be discussed in the EIR.

XV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves a residential subdivision that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. The Department of Parks and Recreation will review the proposed project and identify the appropriate requirements to avoid deterioration of local recreational facilities such as the proposed 14 acre park.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves new recreational facilities. The new facilities include a 14 acre park and pedestrian/equestrian trails. An analysis of the potential impacts of the proposed park and trails would be evaluated in the EIR.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Guidelines) establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. These Guidelines incorporate standards from the County of San Diego Public Road Standards and Public Facilities Element (PFE), the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program and the Congestion Management Program.

A Traffic Impact Study is required to be prepared that will identify the total ADT that would result from the project, and if necessary, describe the distribution to the roadway network and whether the project will have an impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The results of the Traffic Impact Study will be included in the EIR.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) of which the Congestion Management Program (CMP) is an element to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The CMP includes a requirement for enhanced CEQA review applicable to certain large developments that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the project's impacts on CMP system roadways, their associated costs, and identify appropriate mitigation. Early project coordination with affected public agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) is required to ensure that the impacts of new development on CMP transit performance measures are identified.

A Traffic Impact Study is required to be prepared that will identify the total ADT that would result from the project, and if necessary, describe the distribution to CMP designated facilities. If direct and/or cumulative impacts are identified for CMP roadways, mitigation measures will be proposed and discussed to determine whether

those impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels. The results of the Traffic Impact Study will be included in the EIR.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project will take access directly off of Buchman Springs Road and SR 94. Adequate sight distance will be required for the proposed project based on County requirements. A sight distance study is required for the project for all roadway entrances. The results of the sight distance study shall also be discussed in the EIR.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project will be required to demonstrate adequate emergency access (including secondary access) to the satisfaction of the local fire department as well as the Department of Planning and Land Use Fire Marshal. Additionally, on-site roads and any off-site road improvements would be required to be improved to County standards.

f) **Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities ?**

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: A Traffic Impact Study is required to be prepared that will identify the total ADT that would result from the project. The Study will address whether road improvements or new road design features will be required and whether there might be any potential interference with public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. The results of the Traffic Impact Study will be included in the EIR.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project intends on implementing a waste water treatment plant that would be to supplement or replace the existing Del Campo Sanitation District operation and would serve the residential and commercial uses that are proposed. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves new water and wastewater treatment facilities. Based on the potential impacts the project may have on groundwater resources, a groundwater investigation is required to evaluate the significance of potential impacts. A Risk Management Plan (RMP) would be required in

order to assess the impacts of regulated substances such as chlorine gas and ammonia, which are used in these types of facilities. The RMP would include a hazard assessment program, an accidental release prevention program, and an emergency response plan. These technical studies and plans would also be discussed in the context of the requested EIR to be prepared for the project.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. The new facilities include detention basins, culverts, swales, biofilters, curb and gutter in the proposed commercial areas, etc. The construction of such facilities will be analyzed within the EIR.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is proposing to rely upon groundwater to supply the proposed on-site residential and commercial uses. Based on the potential impacts the project may have on groundwater resources, a groundwater investigation is required to evaluate the significance of potential impacts. This assessment will be included and analyzed within the EIR.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. As a result of this evaluation, the project was determined to have potential significant effects related to sensitive species and habitat modification, impacts to riparian habitat and wetlands, wildlife corridors, historical and archaeological resources, interred human remains, and paleontological resources. While mitigation has been proposed in some instances that reduce these effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance and would require discussion and analysis of the above issues in the EIR.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVII of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation/traffic, utilities and service systems. While mitigation may be proposed that could reduce these cumulative effects to a level below significance, the specific mitigation measures and effectiveness of the mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unknown. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance. A list of past, present, and future projects will be provided and a detailed analysis will be included in the context of the EIR to address the above potentially significant cumulative impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions, VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, IX. Hydrology and Water Quality, XII. Noise, XIV. Public Services, XVI. Transportation and Traffic, and XVII. Utilities and Service Systems. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects related to the above listed issues. As stated above, in response to XVIII(a) and (b), this project has been determined to potentially meet the Mandatory Findings of Significance and would require discussion and analysis of the above issues in the context of the EIR.

XIX. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. ((www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. (www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/nhsdatoc.html)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (http://www.wes.army.mil/)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 &13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov, http://www.amlegal.com/,)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (http://www.access.gpo.gov/)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (http://www.census.gov/)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of

Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.